

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MICHAEL H. GRISHAM,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT FAMILY
 COURT OF CLARK COUNTY NEVADA, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:13-cv-02349-JCM-NJK

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
 STRIKE

(Docket No. 25)

Pending before the Court is Defendants' motion to strike Plaintiff's amended complaint. Docket No. 25. Defendants argue that the amended complaint is improper under Fed. R. Civ. P. 15 because Plaintiff did not initially seek leave of court to file it and because his subsequent motion for leave of court cannot cure the procedural defect. *See id.* at 3-4. It is not clear to the Court why Defendants make these arguments through a motion to strike, rather than in a brief opposing the pending motion for leave to file the amended complaint. *See* Docket No. 23. As the arguments appear to be more suitable to the latter, the motion to strike is hereby **DENIED**. The Court expresses no opinion as to the merits of Defendants' arguments and this Order does not preclude them in any way from raising these arguments in opposing the motion for leave to amend.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 29, 2014



 NANCY J. KOPPE
 United States Magistrate Judge